

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMM United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FIL     | ING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |  |
|-----------------|---------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/030,888      | 00      | 6/07/2002  | Markus Leuz          | 10191/2045          | 6086            |  |
| 26646           | 7590    | 06/02/2004 |                      | EXA                 | EXAMINER        |  |
| KENYON          | & KENYO | ON         |                      | TRAN                | , DIEM T        |  |
| ONE BROA        |         | 004        |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER    |  |
|                 | -,      |            |                      | 3748                |                 |  |

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   | 00          |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|
|   | 10/030,888  | LEUZ ET AL.  | 1/1/        |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit   | 7           |  |  |  |  |
|   | Diem Tran   | 3748   | $\bigcup$   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply  | pears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence addre  | 9SS         |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timey within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONEI | rely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this common (35 U.S.C. § 133). | nunication. |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
|   | action is non-final.  |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) 9,11-15,18 and 19 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 9,11-15,18,19 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | wn from consideration.  |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex   | epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj  | e 37 CFR 1.85(a).<br>ected to. See 37 CFR  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Driagity under 25 H S C & 440   |   |  |             |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list  | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  | on No<br>ed in this National St  | age         |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 4) Interview Summary<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Da<br>5) Notice of Informal P<br>6) Other:   | ate  | 52)         |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/030,888

Art Unit: 3748

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and an amendment filed on 4/26/04. In the amendment, claims 1-8, 10, 16, 17 have been canceled, claims 18-19 have been added and claims 9, 11-15 have been amended. Overall, claims 9, 11-15, 18, 19 are pending in this application.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

## The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9, 11-15, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claims 18, 19 of the amendment filed on 4/26/04 the applicants added the claimed limitation "determining a particulate emission rate of the internal combustion engine based on at least: a) one first operating parameter of the internal combustion engine; and b) an oxygen concentration in exhaust gas of the internal combustion engine; and integrating the particulate emission rate over time, resulting in a loading state of the particle filter", and in claim 11 of the amendment filed on 4/26/04 the applicants added the claimed limitation "the step of

Application/Control Number: 10/030,888

Art Unit: 3748

determining the oxygen concentration in the exhaust gas based on one of a

rotational speed and a signal characterizing an injected fuel volume, are

considered new matter since the originally filed disclosure does not contain any support

for the invention as now claimed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

state of the particle filter (see col. 5, lines 42-49).

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 9, 11-13, 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shinzawa et al. (US Patent 5,195,316).

Regarding claims 18, 19, Shinzawa discloses a method for controlling an internal combustion engine having an exhaust treatment system that includes a particle filter, comprising:

calculating a loading state of the filter, the process of calculating including:

determining a particulate emission rate of the internal combustion engine based
on at least one first operating parameter of the internal combustion engine and an
oxygen concentration in exhaust gas of the internal combustion engine (see col. 4, lines
49-52); and integrating the particulate emission rate over time, resulting in a loading

Application/Control Number: 10/030,888

Art Unit: 3748

Regarding claims 9, 11, Shinzawa further discloses that the operating parameter includes a rotational speed (see col. 4, lines 49-53).

Regarding claim 12, Shinzawa further discloses that the step of determining the particulate emission rate includes considering an additional variable representing a temperature in the exhaust treatment system (see col. 4, lines 49-62).

Regarding claim 13, Shinzawa further discloses the step of controlling the exhaust treatment system during a normal operation in accordance with the quantity (see col. 5, lines 45-55).

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shinzawa et al. (US Patent 5,195,316) in view of Hasegawa et al. (US Patent 4,574,589).

Regarding claims 14, 15, Shinzawa discloses all the claimed limitations as discussed in claim 18, however, fails to disclose the step of detecting an error in accordance with the quantity. Hasegawa teaches that it is conventional in the art, to measure a loading of the filter using pressure sensors and compare the loading with a

Application/Control Number: 10/030,888 Page 5

Art Unit: 3748

predicted loading based on engine operating conditions (engine speed and load) to determine an error in the measured loading (see col. 5, lines 1+).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, to have utilized the teaching of Hasegawa in the Shinzawa device, since the use thereof would have improved the operational efficiency for the particulate filter by determining and correcting a loading value of the filter.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Diem Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-6073. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday from 8:00 a.m.- 5:30p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E. Denion, can be reached on (703) 308-2623. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

Diem Tran

Patent Examiner

Art unit 3748

DT May 25, 2004

THOMAS DENION
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700